

N62473-15-R-0811
RADMAC II
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS #6
16 July 2015

1. We have been notified by the Care Taker Office in Treasure Island that there is a waiting line to check out the as-built drawings for Building 253/ 211, which are essential to our understanding of the work and the development of our proposal. Since the timing to obtain these documents is out of our control, and these documents are not posted to AMERDEC Safe Access File Exchange (not available to all contractors equally), can the Navy provide a one week extension to the proposal due date, to August 11, 2015, to provide adequate time for all contractors who wish to assess this information to do so?

RESPONSE: The closing date for the solicitation was extended to 4 August 2015. Please note that during the Industry Forum held on 20 January 2015, and the Questions and Answers #2 dated 22 January, all firms interested in this procurement were advised that documents could be viewed at: (1) Hunters Point Navy Shipyard at 690 Hudson Ave., San Francisco, CA 94124 or the San Francisco Public Library at 100 Larkin St., 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102. (2) Maps and schematics could be found at the Care Taker Office on Treasure Island, One Avenue of the Palms, Suite 161, San Francisco, California. No further extensions are warranted since the documents were available since January 2015.

2. In the Navy's response to RFI#9 posted July 15, 2015, does the Navy's statement; "*The contractor is responsible for restoring the trenches back to the condition before remediation,*" refer to the restoration of the surface condition of the trench (such as concrete, asphalt, gravel, earth, etc.)?
 - a. Can the Navy please define the exact meaning of the term, 'condition before remediation' so we can be sure we will appropriately achieve the required restoration criteria?

RESPONSE: The remedy for the entire base is to prevent direct contact with the soil due to high naturally occurring metals and specifies a "durable" parcel-wide cover, which includes inside buildings. After free-release has been established, the trench areas must have a durable cover to prevent exposure to the soil. The Navy will not direct the contractor of the type of material to be used, but the cover cannot be made out of any material that can be easily removed by hand or hand tools, hence, the "durable" in the description.

3. May we use the acronym "RADMAC II" in our proposal instead of spelling out the solicitation title throughout our technical proposal?

RESPONSE: Yes.

4. Can we have access to building 211 and 253 during the proposal process assessment and characterization purposes?
 - a. If no, can we assume no other potential offerors will be allowed access to the buildings including the characterization survey report contractors?

RESPONSE: No. The working contractor may have to enter to building to perform more surveys to perform additional surveys to finalize the Characterization Report.

5. PWS Section 2.6.1 Waste Material Management:

N62473-15-R-0811
RADMAC II
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS #6
16 July 2015

The PWS requires separate approaches for management and disposition of radiologically (and mixed) contaminated waste and non-radiologically contaminated waste. The contractor is required to manage, transport, and dispose of all non-rad waste; however, the rad waste would ultimately be handled and disposed by the USAJMC contractor at no cost to the RADMAC contractor. Part of the scope of this contract is to characterize all waste material for disposal – and since the waste materials are not currently characterized, there is no way to accurately determine the quantity split between rad and non-rad waste to be generated.

- a. At the site walk, the Navy indicated that the contractors should not assume that all waste will be rad impacted, and thus disposed at no cost to the subcontractor. As such, for bidding purposes, would the Navy consider providing a rad contaminated versus non-rad contaminated percentage split for the following waste types: concrete, soil, piping/ventilation debris, other building material debris?
- b. Would the Navy consider revising the pricing structure to make transportation/disposal of non-rad waste a Fixed Unit Priced item (per ton) with a stipulated quantity and waste type characterization (non haz/haz) – to ensure equitable bid comparison given this potential variable?
- c. In section 2.4.2, last sentence, the PWS states “All piping components and contents will be placed in a LLRW bin and disposed of by another contractor.” Can the Navy confirm that all identified piping removed should be disposed as LLRW?

RESPONSE:

- a. No – It is up to the contractor to determine the amount of contamination depending on the internal draft characterization report.
- b. No
- c. If the piping has already been surveyed and deemed contaminated, then it should be disposed of as LLRW. If the contractor is questioning the status of contamination, resurveying is allowed for proper disposal evaluation.

6. PWS 2.3.1.1 Work Instruction – the PWS says that the contractor shall prepare work instructions for each building SU determined to be contaminated.

- a. Does the Government intend that a separate work instruction be prepared for “each” contaminated survey unit – or can multiple SUs be combined in a work instruction as appropriate?
- b. Does a work instruction only apply to an SU, or would it apply to other removal activities?
 - a. What is the stipulated/required format for a work instruction?
 - b. Please provide an example of a work instruction.

RESPONSE:

- a. Multiple SUs can be combined in a work instruction.
- b. No, a work instruction can be used on other removal activities.
- c. The Navy does not have any required format for a work instruction. An acceptable work instruction has the description of the site, statement of the problem, and an explanation of the planned work to be completed. They can be accompanied by a figure or a table. Work instructions can range from 2 to 10 pages.
- d. An example of a work instruction is not necessary for submittal of this proposal. An example will not be provided at this time.

N62473-15-R-0811
RADMAC II
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS #6
16 July 2015

7. PWS 2.5.1 Final Status Survey Reports – What format is required for the SUPR? Can we assume that the format will be consistent with the SUPRs that are referenced (and provided by the Government) as part of this PWS? Or, are the updated requirements for this report from the Navy and/or Regulators? If so, please provide the specific guidance and format that is expected for these reports.

RESPONSE: The same format should be followed unless otherwise directed at time of award.

8. Are there available asbestos or lead survey reports for these buildings?

RESPONSE: All of the areas that need to be remediated have had the proper asbestos and lead abatement. The lead and asbestos surveys are not needed for this proposal.

9. Per PWS Section 2.3.3, the Contractor shall develop a revision to the *Final Basewide Radiological Removal Action – Action Memorandum, Hunters Point Shipyard, San Francisco, California (Revision 2006)* focusing on revising the release criteria set forth in Table 1.

- a. Please clarify what endpoint criteria should be applied to develop survey costs for Buildings 253 and 211. If the survey is to be based on the current revision, please confirm the criteria for Th-232.
- b. Internal Draft Characterization Survey Results, Building 253, Section 12: This section states that the asphaltic brick associated with the exterior promenade on the 6th floor of Building 253 is recommended for removal. Can the Contractor propose alternatives to remediating the asphaltic brick?

RESPONSE: a. The purpose of the revision is for the contractor to provide any suggested criteria.
b. Yes, the area must be able to obtain free-release.